

REMARKS

The pending claims are amended, and, thus, the pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is requested. No new matter has been added.

Independent claims 1, 54 and 66 are rejected 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. The claims are amended. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-15, 19-25, 31-57, 59-69 and 71-77 are rejected under USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford (US Publication no. 2002-0107939) and Nagasaka (US Patent No. 6,556,875).

The independent claims are 1, 54, and 66.

An aspect of an embodiment of the invention is composition of an executable task that is a combination of two or more services, namely the language of claim 1 provides “dynamically presenting to the user feasible possible executable tasks based upon ~~one or more of~~ filtering the ... services according to one or more of a context of the user ~~including and/or~~ the composed executable task, the filter parameters in the SSDs, and/or the semantic input/output parameters in the SSDs.” For example, paragraph 168 supports an embodiment of the invention as related to the filtering of the services.

The Office Action acknowledges that Ford does not discuss composition of an executable task that is a combination of two or more services, so the Office Action relies upon Nagasaka. However, Nagasaka discusses predefining a data path between a source and a destination to provide a composite device. In other words, Nagasaka’s composite device discussed in column 23, lines 25-34 and columns 29-30 and column 26, lines 60-64 is essentially a predefined association of output of one device into input of another device, which fails to disclose expressly or implicitly composition of an executable task that is a combination of two or more services “based upon ~~one or more of~~ filtering the ... services according to one or more of a context of the user ~~including and/or~~ the composed executable task, the filter parameters in the SSDs, and/or the semantic input/output parameters in the SSDs.”

The Office Action also relies upon Nagasaka column 8, lines 4-20, which discusses ‘The respective device controllers 30a and 30b provide the upper constituents, such as the interface units 22a and 22b, with identical interfaces and carry out complete abstraction of the devices.’

The Office Action also relies upon Nagasaka column 31, lines 10-19, which discusses ‘The combination display window 480 shows the names of the source device and the destination

device with respect to each combination of the devices that have been correlated with each other in the past by means of the computer 100 and determined to be operable as the composite device, together with the latest date and time of the correlation.'

However, Nagasaka's FIGS 1 and 21 and discussions of device abstraction and combination of the devices that have been correlated are silent on, and nothing has been cited or found, either expressly or implicitly, in Nagasaka or Ford, that it would have been obvious to modify Nagasaka or Ford for how to compose an executable task that is a combination of two or more of services according to an embodiment of the invention, namely the language of claim 1 provides "composing by a user ~~ana composed~~ executable task ~~comprising combining~~that is a combination of two or more of the available services by dynamically presenting to the user feasible possible executable tasks based upon ~~one or more of~~ filtering the ... available services according to one or more of a context of the user ~~including and/or~~ the composed executable task, the filter parameters in the SSDs, and/or the semantic input/output parameters in the SSDs."

For example, Nagasaka does not discuss context of the user, context of the executable task, SSD filter parameter, and/or SSD semantic input/output parameter for filtering of services and presenting to the user feasible possible executable tasks.

Accordingly, a prima facie case of obviousness based upon Ford and Nagasaka cannot be established, and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and allowance of claim 1 is requested.

Independent claims 54 and 66 have limitations similar to the discussed limitations of amended claim 1.

Dependent claims recite patentably distinguishing features of their own or are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependencies from the independent claims.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/733,328

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: _____ November 23, 2009 _____ By: _____
Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501